

CALNET II RFP DGS-2053 Question and Answer Set #12
March 17, 2005

1. Regarding Cost Table 6.3.7, Toll Free Services. Can you provide the breakdown of the 52M Toll Free minutes broken out the way they broke out the Outbound Minutes? For example, InterLATA switch-switch and IntraLATA switch-switch. Additionally, can we get a quantity of the number of Toll Free numbers that are on the CALNET contract currently that would need to be ported?

Answer: A breakdown of the Toll Free calls and minutes is provided below.

CALNET I Toll Free Service Information

| Type/Location | September-04 | | October-04 | | November-04 | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Calls | Mins | Calls | Mins | Calls | Mins |
| Alaska | 1,221 | 7,999 | 1,475 | 7,144 | 1,351 | 6,615 |
| Canada | 1,951 | 8,720 | 1,886 | 8,960 | 1,953 | 8,775 |
| Guam - Mariana Providence | 232 | 1,508 | 274 | 1,218 | 281 | 1,118 |
| Hawaii | 4,561 | 28,382 | 4,944 | 30,105 | 5,323 | 30,522 |
| International | 156 | 547 | 143 | 417 | 980 | 3,168 |
| Interstate | 396,982 | 2,856,366 | 442,827 | 2,917,189 | 457,495 | 2,660,363 |
| IntraLATA | 1,781,276 | 9,289,079 | 1,767,840 | 8,654,328 | 2,636,417 | 11,549,328 |
| Intrastate | 7,824,448 | 27,250,908 | 9,043,419 | 30,008,533 | 9,638,480 | 32,056,953 |
| Puerto Rico | 377 | 2,015 | 474 | 2,241 | 402 | 2,099 |
| Virgin Islands | 51 | 241 | 57 | 306 | 61 | 308 |
| | | | | | | |
| Total | 10,011,255 | 39,445,765 | 11,263,339 | 41,630,441 | 12,742,743 | 46,319,249 |

Quantity of CALNET Toll Free Numbers = 1584

2. On the file you sent us for remote addresses for data service IXC, can you provide the same kind of spreadsheet with the quantities of dedicated LD Voice T1's that run inbound and outbound long distance traffic to include whether they are with or without PRI signaling?

Answer: Information on the LD Voice T1s is not currently available from the CALNET I Contractor. DGS will continue to pursue obtaining detailed data from the incumbent Contractor and provide it when it becomes available.

3. Section 2.3.1.1.1 says that the "Compliance Phase" is "optional". The Compliance Phase includes the Conceptual Proposal. Does this mean if we don't submit a Conceptual Proposal; we are not out of the running? Or was this just language that was left in by mistake?

Answer: Section 2 is used in all DGS formal IT procurements and speaks in generalities. This statement in Section 2 means that it is the State's option to hold a compliance phase in the formal procurement process, depending on the nature and

complexity of the procurement. In the case of CALNET II, the State has opted to hold a compliance phase in accordance with the Key Action Dates as set forth in Section 1 of the RFP. You are not precluded from submitting a Draft or Final Proposal if a Conceptual Proposal is not submitted; however, it is not advisable to skip that phase as it could put you at a significant disadvantage with the other competitive bidders that submit Conceptual Proposals. The benefit of submitting a Conceptual Proposal is that it allows for feedback from the State concerning your proposed solution and provides for face-to-face dialogue with regard to any issues concerning the project in Confidential Discussions with the State. Bidders will not be afforded the opportunity of a Confidential Discussion without first submitting a proposal for discussion.

4. Can we please get call statistics for the existing CALNET contract international calls for an average month?

Answer: Listed below is the information that represents the international call data from December, 2004.

| All International Calls | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------------------|
| SUBCLASS1 | Term Country | Sum of Minutes | Sum of Calls | Average Duration of Call in MIN |
| CANADA | CANADA | 22671.9 | 6172 | 3.67 |
| DIR_ASST | CANADA | 33.5 | 20 | 1.68 |
| DIR_ASST | INTL | 5.2 | 6 | 0.87 |
| INTL | INTL | 23759.4 | 5180 | 4.59 |
| OPS_SVCS | CANADA | 14 | 5 | 2.80 |
| OPS_SVCS | INTL | 452 | 54 | 8.37 |
| | Total | 46,936 | 11,437 | 4.10 |

| Subset of Int'l Calls...Calls to Mexico | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------------------------|
| CORPID | Term Country | Sum of Minutes | Sum of Calls | Average Duration of Call in MIN |
| 90307757 | MEXICO | 9511.3 | 2386 | 3.99 |
| 90313116 | MEXICO | 476 | 106 | 4.49 |
| 92252500 | MEXICO | 47.9 | 15 | 3.19 |
| 92345725 | MEXICO | 2.4 | 4 | 0.60 |
| 92413030 | MEXICO | 0.9 | 1 | 0.90 |
| 99674987 | MEXICO | 79.9 | 17 | 4.70 |
| 99991334 | MEXICO | 317.9 | 37 | 8.59 |
| | Total | 10,436.3 | 2,566 | 4.07 |

5. Can two or more companies that are owned by the same stockholders act as “co-primes” for the CALNET II award as long as there is a single point of contact from the combined entity?

Answer: The State is open in principal to the concept of “co-prime” relationship of companies within the same corporate structure. However it must be clear that the State’s expectation is not merely one of “single point of contact” but also “single point of responsibility.” The State will have to be able to deal with the co-primes as a single entity and expects the prime contractor (or co-primes) to be responsible and accountable for the contractual obligations of its sub-contractors and affiliates without any “finger pointing” between the co-primes or abdication of responsibility. Moreover the State also requires further information on the business and legal relationships between entities and/or any regulatory limitations or restrictions that may dictate how services shall be marketed, sold, priced, provisioned, or how corporate resources can (or cannot) be leveraged to support other business entities in providing services to CALNET II. The State cannot make a final determination on a co-prime proposal without this detail and any other information the bidder believes pertinent for the State to have in making its policy determination.

6. 6.11.4 Provisioning Implementation Requirements (p.135) / Bullet 3 "Perform these service order/completion functions via relational database programs." Please provide additional clarification/ overview of what "Relational Database means to DGS and the intent of its use.

Answer: The reference to “relational database” was deleted from this section with Addendum 6. The database requirements are specifically stated in Sections 6.16. and 6.17.

7. Regarding Submittal of the Proposed Changes to Contract Language: In reading both Section 8 for the Changes to the Contract Language requirements and in Appendix A, it does not clearly define how many copies or format (hard copy and/or CD) of the annotated Contract the State requires. For the Proposed Changes to Contract Language submittal, how many copies and type of format (hard copy and/or CD) are required by the State?

Answer: Appendix B, Model Contract Language, is provided in Word format on the CALNET II website to facilitate change requests. Please use this Word document and make redlines (using track changes) to all proposed changes to the contract language. Also, provide justification for each proposed change. Please provide one redlined Word document in hard-copy and also attach and transmit the redlined Word document to the State’s designated Procurement Official via e-mail by the submittal date.